



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,079	11/28/2000	Wilhelmus Hubertus Paulus Maria Heijnen	TS6196 (US)	5093

7590 07/23/2002

Del S. Christensen
Shell Oil Company
Legal - Intellectual Property
P. O. Box 2463
Houston, TX 77252-2463

EXAMINER

OMGBA, ESSAMA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3726

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/724,079	Applicant(s) Wilhelmus H. P. M. Heijnen
	Examiner Essama Omgbra

Cn

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 7, 2002

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on May 7, 2002 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gabor et al. (DE 3407467).

Gabor et al. discloses a method of connecting a first pipe 1 to a second pipe 2 having an end part fitting into an end part of the first pipe, the method comprising inserting the end part of the second pipe within the end part of the first pipe, arranging a sleeve 5 of deformable material between the end parts, and radially expanding the end part of the second pipe towards the end part of the first pipe so as to bias the sleeve between the end parts, see abstract and figures 1 and

2. With regards to the recitation that the first pipe is an upper wellbore casing and the second pipe is a lower wellbore casing, the examiner submits that the pipes of Gabor et al. could be called upper and lower wellbore casings. Applicant has not set forth any structure that would define over Gabor et al.'s pipes.

Art Unit: 3726

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabor et al. in view of Kapgan et al. (US Patent 5,662,362).

With regards to claims 2-5, Gabor et al. discloses a method of connecting pipes as shown above. Even though Gabor et al. does not disclose the deformable sleeve as being a shape-memory alloy made of a hard elastomer or a ductile metal, such shape-memory alloy material are old and well known as attested by Kapgan et al., see column 1, lines 21-40. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have used a ductile shape-memory alloy in Gabor et al.'s method, in light of the teachings of Kapgan et al., in order to ensure a leak free coupling of the pipes. Applicant should note that the use of two shape-memory sleeves arranged concentrically between the end parts is an obvious matter of design choice wherein no stated problem is solved or unexpected results obtained in using a single sleeve versus two sleeves.

For claims 6 and 7, see figures 1 and 2 of Gabor et al.

For claim 8, Applicant should note that the structure of the device lends no patentable weight to the method being claimed.

Art Unit: 3726

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/7/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., use of the connection method of the present invention to hang a lower casing from an upper casing) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore as noted in paragraph No.2 of the current Office action, Applicant has not set forth any structure that would define the upper and lower wellbore casings over the art of record. Nothing precludes the pipes of Gabor et al. to be called upper and lower wellbore casings.

In view of the above remarks, the examiner maintains that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established in the instant application.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 3726

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

7. Official documents related to the instant application may be submitted to the Technology Center 3700 mail center by facsimile at (703) 305-3579/3580. Should Applicant desire to submit a DRAFT response to the Examiner by facsimile transmission, then Applicant should contact the Examiner at the number below for instructions concerning the transmission of DRAFT documents. Applicant is reminded to clearly mark any facsimile transmission as "DRAFT" if it is not to be considered as an official response.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Essama Omgbra at telephone number (703) 305-2915.



S. THOMAS HUGHES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

eo
July 16, 2002